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The corresponding author, Stephen G. Ware, has requested that the readers be made aware of the following mistake in the above named paper:

In the last paragraph of page 37, the authors incorrectly conflate the definition of novelty pruning given in this paper with the original given by Geffner and Lipovetzky (2012) for the IW algorithm. IW defines a state’s novelty relative to the whole search space, but in this paper it is defined relative only to a state’s previous states. This difference is required because in narrative planning, unlike in classical planning, not every path to a state is guaranteed to be valid, because some steps in that path may never get explained. This difference led the authors to wrongly imply (on pages 37 and 40) that breadth-first search planning with novelty pruning is always optimal. There does exist a threshold of n for which BFS with novelty pruning solves a problem optimally, but there could exist a lower threshold for which the algorithm will still return a solution which is non-optimal (has more than the fewest possible number of steps).